

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program
Evaluation Criteria

State Parks Category

This project category is reserved for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission for acquisition and/or development of state parks.

IAC Manual 10.

WWRP - State Parks Criteria Analysis					
Score	#	Title	A/D	Mult/Mx	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	A/D	2/10.0	Loc
Team	2	Project Significance	A/D	1/5.0	St
Team	3	Project Design	D	2/10.0	Tech
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat	A	2/10.0	St
Team	5	Site Suitability	A/D	3/15.0	Tech
Team	6	Expansion / Phased Project	A/D	1/5.0	St
Team	7	Diversity of Recreation	A/D	2/10.0	St
Team	8	Project Support	A/D	2/10.0	St/Loc
Team	9	Cost Efficiencies	A/D	1/5.0	Loc
Prescore	10	Population Proximity	A/D	0.5/5.0	St
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE				A= 75 / D= 75	

KEY:

Prescore	=	Criteria <i>prescored</i> by IAC staff
Team	=	Criteria scored by interdisciplinary <i>team</i>
A/D	=	Acquisition or Development specific question
Mult/Mx	=	Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
Focus	=	<i>St/Loc/Tech</i> ; Criteria orientation in accordance with SCORP policy of developing evaluation systems based on three need factors: those that meet general <i>statewide</i> needs (often called for in RCW or SCORP), those that meet <i>local</i> needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans), and those that meet <i>technical</i> considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

WWRP SCORING CRITERIA

State Parks

Team Scored

1. **PUBLIC NEED. Considering the availability of existing sites within at least 15 miles of the project site, what is the need for additional sites?**

Acquisition/Development; *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapters 1, 5.

Establish need by inventorying all available sites of comparable opportunities (quality / quantity / use) within the minimum 15 mile service radius *and* considering whether or not the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan.

Other considerations:

- Are nearby sites used to capacity?
- Are there unserved or under served user groups?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised May 7, 2003

2. **PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE. The extent that the project is of statewide/regional/local significance.**

Acquisition/Development

Assess the degree of importance the project has to the state as a whole. A number of factors should be considered with the minimum factors being the degree of uniqueness (e.g. an island chain) and the scale of the project or resource (e.g. a large water body).

- a. *No evidence* of statewide/regional significance (ordinary and of moderate to small scale) (0 points)
- b. The project is of *regional significance* (special/ordinary and of moderate to small scale) (1-2 points)
- c. The project is of *major regional significance* (very special and of at least moderate scale) (3 points)
- d. The project is of *statewide significance* (unique/very special and of broad scale).
..... (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised June 2, 1995

3. **PROJECT DESIGN. Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?**

Development

To measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site plan as particularly related to the site and the proposed uses. Some design elements that may be considered include:

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ➤ Phasing | ➤ User Friendly/Barrier Free |
| ➤ Materials | ➤ Space Relationships |
| ➤ Maintenance | ➤ Recreation Experiences |
| ➤ Risk Management | ➤ Aesthetics. |
| ➤ Accuracy of Cost Estimates | |

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised June 5, 1995

4. **IMMEDIACY OF THREAT. The extent that there is a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses.**

Acquisition

Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exist, the significance of a threat may be higher.

- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. *Minimal threat*; site resource opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use *in the next 36 months* (1-2 points)
- c. Actions are under *consideration* that *could* result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use (3 points)
- d. *Actions will be taken* that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use
or
A threat situation has occurred or is imminent and has led a *land trust* to acquire rights in the property at the request of the applicant agency. (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2

Revised July 1996

5. **SITE SUITABILITY. Is the site well suited for the intended recreational uses?**

Acquisition/Development

Compare environmental and other site features against the proposed use of the site. Examine the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site, to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. In general, sites most compatible to the uses proposed score higher.

- a. **Acquisition projects.** Is the site to be acquired well-suited for the intended recreational/environmental uses?
- or**
- b. **Development projects.** Will site resources be appropriately made available for recreation; will their environmental or other important values be protected by proposed development?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised July 1996

6. **EXPANSION/PHASED. Will the acquisition or development project expand an existing recreation area or facility?**

Acquisition/Development. *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

Recognizes that expansion/phased projects generally provide greater benefit-to-cost ratios than new projects. Projects that add to existing state assets also often provide greater management flexibility and resource diversity.

- a. The project *does not* expand or develop an already existing site (0 points)
- b. The project acquires or develops a *minor* but *not* crucial parcel or facilities to the existing site (1-2 points)
- c. The project acquires or develops a *major* or significant parcel or facilities to the existing site (3 points)
- d. The project acquires or develops an addition to an already existing project of *statewide significance* (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised May 7, 2003

7. **DIVERSITY OF RECREATIONAL/ENVIRONMENTAL/OTHER RESOURCES/USES. To what extent does this project provide diversity of possible recreational resource experiences or activities?**

Acquisition/Development. *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007*, Chapters 1 and 5.

Sites can provide the opportunity for a variety of recreational/preservation uses. In general, projects providing more *compatible* recreation/preservation uses will score better than projects providing just one type of opportunity.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised May 7, 2003

8. **PROJECT SUPPORT. The extent that the public (statewide, community, and/or user groups) has been provided with an adequate *opportunity to become informed*, and/or *support for the project* seems apparent.**

Acquisition/Development

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
 - The extent that there is project support, including:
 - ▷ Voter approved initiatives/bond issues/referenda
 - ▷ Ordinance and resolution adoption
 - ▷ Public meeting attendance
 - ▷ Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user/"friends" groups
 - ▷ Media coverage
 - ▷ The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.
- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing),
and/or
Little evidence that the public supports the project (1-2 points)
- c. Adequate support (3 points)
- d. The public has received ample and varied opportunity to provide meaningful input into the project, and there is overwhelming support;
and/or
The public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised March 1997

9. **COST EFFICIENCIES. The extent that the project demonstrates efficiencies and/or reduces government costs through documented use of:**

- **Volunteers,**
- **Donations,**
- ***Signed* cooperative agreements or**
- ***Signed* memoranda of understanding (such as no cost easements/leases, maintenance/operation arrangements, or similar cost savings).**

Acquisition/Development. *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

- a. *No* evidence presented.(0 point)
- b. The benefit of any such agreement is *marginal*.....(1-2 points)
- c. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *moderate* efficiencies and/or savings.(3 points)
- d. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *substantial* efficiencies and/or savings.(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised May 7, 2003

Prescored

10. **PROXIMITY TO HUMAN POPULATIONS. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities/towns, and county density?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks)

This question is scored by IAC staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive credit, the map must describe the project area and contain a circle with a five-mile radius. As its hub, the circle must use the point on the project's boundary closest to a city or town. The single city or town (if any, including urban growth area boundary) with the highest population touched by the circle is counted in part "a," below. The result from "a" (cities) is added to the result from "b" (counties). This takes into account that counties with high *average* densities are made up of both high and low density areas. Projects located near cities over 5000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b".

- a. Within 5 miles of a GMA urban growth area boundary or the boundary of an incorporated city/town. In either case, the score is based on the city/town population (OFM):

▶	0 -	4,999.....	(0 points)
▶	5,000 -	9,999.....	(1 point)
▶	10,000 -	29,999.....	(2 points)
▶	30,000 -	149,999.....	(3 points)
▶	150,000 -	299,999.....	(4 points)
▶	300,000 -	and above.....	(5 points)

- b. In a county with a population density (OFM) of:

▶	0 -	249.....	(0 points)
▶	250 -	324.....	(1 point)
▶	325 -	399.....	(2 points)
▶	400 -	474.....	(3 points)
▶	475 -	549.....	(4 points)
▶	550 -	and above.....	(5 points)

IAC staff awards a maximum of 10 points that are later multiplied by 0.5

Revised May 7, 2003

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Outdoor Recreation Account

Instructions to Evaluators:

Score All. To ensure statistical parity among projects, each evaluator will score *all* proposals. While interpretation of team-scored criteria is at the discretion of individual evaluators, the guidelines in each instrument should be used.

Consistency. Individual team members may consider different aspects of projects important. Some evaluators may give high scores all the way through, while others may give lower scores. It is most important, however, that each evaluator score all projects in a consistent manner throughout the rating process.

Judge the Evidence. Final scores will depend on an evaluator's personal appraisal of, and confidence in, the information presented. Weak or unsubstantiated claims will be scored accordingly.

Voice Opinions. Evaluators are expected to discuss each proposal with other team members and presenters. Active participation and critical thinking is important. Comments on strengths, weaknesses and the number of evaluation points that should be awarded are all encouraged. Comments, however, must remain pertinent to the current project.

Two forms are supplied to assist evaluators:

1. WWRP SCORING CRITERIA pages will not be collected from team members. These guidelines are for use during the presentations. Evaluators should consult them for project scoring advice.
2. PROJECT SCORE SUMMARY pages, that evaluators will use to record all scores. Evaluators will award *whole number* scores for each criteria; no fractions, please. These pages will be collected at the end of this category and at the end of each day. This procedure is designed to allow team members time to check consistency by reviewing individual scores awarded in each category.

After collecting the Score Summary sheets, *IAC staff will* factor in multipliers, total all scores, and list projects in final rank order.

Revised March 1998